

REMARKS**Summary of the Office Action**

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Miyashita et al. (US 5,184,236).

Claims 4 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Song et al. (US 6,215,541).

Claims 2 and 3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyashita et al. in view of Kubo et al. (US 6,624,864).

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Song et al. in view of Youn et al. (US 6,583,841).

Claims 7 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Song et al. in view of Kubo et al.

The Specification is objected to because the Title of the Invention is allegedly not descriptive.

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicant has amended the Title of the Invention, amended claims 1 and 4 to further define the invention, and canceled claim 6. Accordingly, claims 1-5 and 7-18 are pending for consideration with claims 9-18 being withdrawn.

Objection to the Specification

The Specification is objected to because the Title of the Invention is allegedly not descriptive. Accordingly, Applicant has amended the Title to recite "LIQUID CRYSTAL DISPLAY HAVING A PROTECTIVE ALIGNMENT FILM AND FABRICATING METHOD THEREOF." Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that the Title, as presently amended, is clearly

indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed, and respectfully requests that the objection to the Specification be withdrawn.

All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Miyashita et al. (US 5,184,236), claims 4 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Song et al. (US 6,215,541), claims 2 and 3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyashita et al. in view of Kubo et al. (US 6,624,864), claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Song et al. in view of Youn et al. (US 6,583,841), and claims 7 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Song et al. in view of Kubo et al. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections as being based upon references, either applied singly or in combination, that neither teach nor suggest the novel combination of features recited in amended independent claims 1 and 4, and hence dependent claims 2, 3, 5, 7, and 8.

Initially, Applicant respectfully asserts that the present application was filed on December 31, 2001, and therefore is governed by 35 U.S.C. § 103(c), as revised on November 29, 1999. The subject matter of Youn et al., Kwak et al., and the present invention were, at the time the invention was made, commonly owned by LG.Philips LCD Co., Ltd. of Seoul, Korea. Therefore, the disclosures of Youn et al. and Kwak et al. cannot preclude patentability of the present invention under 35 U.S.C. § 103(c). Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that the rejection of claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Youn et al. is not applicable, and should be withdrawn.

Independent claims 1 and 4, as amended, both recite a liquid crystal display device including “a common line laterally adjacent to the pixel electrode along a direction of one of the gate and data lines,” wherein “the alignment film contacts the common line.”

In contrast to Applicant’s claimed invention, Miyashita et al. teaches a liquid crystal display device having pixel electrodes 105 and a common electrode 103 disposed along a direction perpendicular to gate and data lines. Similarly, both Song et al. and Kubo et al. are completely silent with respect to an alignment film contacting a common line. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that none of Miyashita et al., Song et al., and Kubo et al., whether taken singly or combined, teach or suggest “a common line laterally adjacent to the pixel electrode along a direction of one of the gate and data lines,” wherein “the alignment film contacts the common line,” as recited by independent claims 1 and 4, as amended, and hence dependent claims 2, 3, 5, 7, and 8.

For the above reasons, Applicant respectfully asserts that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(b), 102(e), and 103(a) should be withdrawn because neither Miyashita et al., Song et al., and Kubo et al., whether taken singly or combined, teach or suggest the novel combination of features of independent claims 1 and 4, as amended, and hence dependent claims 2, 3, 5, 7, and 8.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner believe that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant’s undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: Mary Jane Boswell
Mary Jane Boswell
Reg. No. 33,652

Dated: August 27, 2004

Customer Number: 009629
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20004
(202)739-3000